

#### Amendments of the Drawings

The attached Replacement Sheets 5 and 20 of the drawings are formal versions of the informal drawings as filed. Neither Sheet 5 nor Sheet 20 includes changes, except as are attendant to the more formal nature of the replacement drawings. Accordingly, no annotated sheets are attached.

Applicant further notes in the Image File Wrapper that sheet 20, containing FIG. 20, appears to have been filed in duplicate. There should be only one FIG. 20 in the application, and to the extent necessary, applicant hereby cancels the second FIG. 20.

Attachments: Replacement Sheets 5 and 20 of 20

## REMARKS

### Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-95 were pending in the above-identified patent application. Of those, claims 1-28, 40-55, 57-80, 85-88 and 90-95 had been withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a nonelected invention.

The Examiner rejected claims 81-84 and 89 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hart et al. U.S. Patent 6,621,325. Claims 29, 31-34, 37-39 and 56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Hart in view of Kang et al. U.S. Patent 6,759,873.

The Examiner also objected to FIG. 18 of the drawings.

Allowable subject matter was indicated in claims 30, 35 and 36.

### Summary of Applicant's Reply

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 30, 35 and 36.

Applicant has amended the specification, and has proposed amending FIGS. 5 and 20 of the drawings, in order to more particularly describe the invention, and has amended claims 29, 34-37, 81, 83, 84 and 89, and has cancelled claims 30-33 and 82 without prejudice, in order to more particularly define the invention. The Examiner's objection and rejections are respectfully traversed.

### Applicant's Reply to The Drawing Objection

The Examiner objected to FIG. 18 of the drawings, stating that "1860" and "1870" in the drawing should be "1850" and "1860," respectively, to be consistent with the specification, and has required a corrected drawing. This objection is respectfully traversed.

Instead of proposing an amendment of FIG. 18, applicant has amended the specification at Paragraph [0079] to conform to FIG. 18 as filed. This approach to the objection not only eliminates the inconsistency between FIG. 18 and Paragraph [0079], but also maintains consistency between the numbering convention in FIG. 18 and the numbering convention in other drawings.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the drawing objection be withdrawn.

Although applicant is not proposing an amendment of FIG. 18, applicant is submitting substitute Sheets 5 and 20, containing FIGS. 5 and 20, respectively. Each of FIGS. 5 and 20 as filed included at least some hand-drawn material. The substitute drawings are more formal than FIGS. 5 and 20 as filed in that they contain no hand-drawn material, but are substantively identical to FIGS. 5 and 20 as filed. Accordingly, no annotated drawings are being submitted.

Entry of substitute FIGS. 5 and 20 is respectfully requested.

Applicant further notes in the Image File Wrapper that sheet 20, containing FIG. 20, appears to have been filed in duplicate. There should be only one FIG. 20 in the application, and to the extent necessary, applicant hereby cancels the second FIG. 20.

Applicant's Reply to  
The Prior Art Rejection

Claims 81-84 and 89 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hart. Claims 29, 31-34, 37-39 and 56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Hart in view of Kang. However, allowable subject matter was indicated in claims 30, 35 and 36.

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended claim 29 to incorporate the limitations of allowable claim 30, and accordingly has cancelled claim 30 without prejudice to its subject matter, which remains in claim 29. Claims 31-33 also have been cancelled without prejudice. Accordingly, claim 29, and claims 34, 38 and 39 depending therefrom, as amended, are patentable.

Applicant has amended claims 56 and 89 in a similar manner and respectfully submits that claims 56 and 89, as amended, are patentable.

Applicant has rewritten allowable claims 35 and 36 in independent form, and accordingly claims 35 and 36, as amended, are patentable.

Applicant also has rewritten claim 37 in independent form and respectfully submits that claim 37 is patentable. Claim 37 defines a method, for reducing power consumption in a programmable logic device, that includes dynamically reverse biasing a plurality of transistors, to operate in low power mode, based on signals received during operation via an input pin. The Examiner purports to find this limitation in Hart, at column 5, lines 32-40. However, the cited passage in Hart refers to signals in configuration bits which are set during programming and remain static during operation. There is no teaching or suggestion in Hart (or Kang) to dynamically reverse bias any transistor based on signals received from a pin during operation. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claim 37, as amended, is patentable.

Claim 82 was similar to claim 37. Applicant has amended independent claim 81 to incorporate the limitations of claim 82 and accordingly has cancelled claim 82 without prejudice to its subject matter, which remains in claim 81. Applicant also has amended dependent claim 84 to refer to dynamically forward biasing transistors based on signals received during operation via an input pin. Applicant

respectfully submits that claim 81 and its dependent claims, as amended, are patentable.

For these reasons, applicant respectfully submits that claims 29, 34-39, 56, 81, 83, 84 and 89, as amended, are patentable.

#### Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, applicant respectfully submits that this application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey H. Ingerman/

---

Jeffrey H. Ingerman  
Registration No. 31,069  
Attorney for Applicant  
FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP  
ROPES & GRAY LLP  
Customer No. 36981  
1211 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-8704  
Tel.: (212) 596-9000